



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,329	02/13/2002	Peter Kenneth Attwood	19111.0072	4553
68009 7590 06/12/2009 Hanify & King, P.C. 1055 Thomas Jefferson Street, NW Suite 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20007				
EXAMINER				
TRUONG, LECHI				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2194				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/12/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/073,329

Applicant(s)

ATTWOOD, PETER KENNETH

Examiner

LECHI TRUONG

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-8 are presented for the examination. Claims 2, 9 are cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claim 8 is rejected as non-statutory because it is not tangibly embodied.

Claim 8 define a computer readable medium in the preamble. However, the specification discloses this medium to be a transmission media. Transmission media is not the tangible medium; therefore, claim 8 is non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims **1, 4-5, 7-8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmerman (US 2004/0226031) in view of Popp (US 7162596 B2) and further in view of Hoover et al (US. Patent 5, 560005).

As to claim 1, Zimmerman teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a first data handling application (the application program, para [0005], ln 3-7 to para [0005], ln 7-10), a second data handling application (the dynamic library, para [0005], ln 3-7 to para [0005], ln 7-10), call routine (a function call, para [0005], ln 7-10), at least one call routine which is executed when the second data handling application is operated (para [0001], ln 8-12), a software routine (call library routine to perform functions, para[0001], ln 1-8), determining the presence of the second data handling application and, if it is present generating a link to a software routine(The static library 30 passes application calls through to a found DLL. The DLL, in contrast, actually implements all of the API calls of the application, para [0021], ln 4-10), If the DLL is missing or determined to be incorrect version (ie., no supporting DLL is found) 56, the application interface return 64.... At this point, the calling application may ask the user if the updated DLL should be downloaded... download the update DLL from the Web server 14... The application interface 40 then transfers calls directed to a method within the object on the DLL interface 42, which passes the calls on to the updated DLL 32(now DLL 32, once stored on the user's machine, para [0025], ln 1-17/ right col 4, ln 41-49/ para [0045], ln 40-48), which will be executed by the call routine in the second data handling application (para [0001], ln 1-12), causes a software routine or the first self-contained data handling application to be executed(para[0002],ln 5-9/para[0007], ln 6-10).

Zimmerman does not explicitly teach writing source code that defines the call routine of the second self-contained data handling application. However, Popp teaches writing source code that defines the call routine of the second self-contained data handling application(The resource database 140 is a self-contained object providing an application programming interface (API) for those processes wishing to manipulate the resource list and resource data, col 7, ln 62-67).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Zimmerman with Popp to incorporate the feature of writing source code that defines the call routine of the second self-contained data handling application because this provides a specific implementation of the database 140 can occur in many different ways.

Zimmerman and Brown do not teach the first self-contained data handling application and the second previously installed, self contained data handling application are operable to execute without the each other. However, Hoover teaches first self-contained data handling application and the second previously installed, self contained data handling application are operable to execute without the each other(a customer's computer system or database, identified as CUST DB1 26a, is functionally and logically connected to a remote database (RDB 1) 28a, which may be (but is not necessarily) implemented as a separate computing entity, col 10, ln 14-18/ allowing computer communications between remote distributed heterogeneous databases such as those maintained by health insurance companies, employers, hospitals, physicians, and other health care industry participants. The present invention fills the need for the rapid and efficient exchange of information between the various entities in the industry to allow for

increased efficiencies in patient admission, patient handling, payment transaction handling, insurance claim processing, and the like, col 11, ln 1-10/ Communications between the server computer 40d (comprising the RDB 28a) and the customer databases that are maintained by one or more of the CPU's 40a-40c (comprising the customer database 26a) are communicated on the LAN 47. Accordingly, the API between the customer's database equipment 26 and the RDB's 28 are passed as data communication packets on the LAN 47, col 12, ln 52-60/ the remote database functions in the RDB computers 28 can be carried out as a separate process on a user computer that normally executes the customer database functions 26. Similarly, in the preferred embodiment, access to the system can be made by a stand-alone computer and modem, Col 13, ln 1-5).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Zimmerman, Brown with Hoover to incorporate the feature of first self-contained data handling application and the second previously installed, self contained data handling application are operable to execute without the each other because this facilitates location and retrieval of data items from one or more of the remote, heterogeneous user databases.

As to claim 4, Zimmerman teaches the call routine is only implemented by the second data handling application under certain predetermined conditions (para [0045], ln 40-50, if the library is present, passing the function call to the library for execution).

As to claims 5, 7- 8, they are apparatus claims of claims 1, 4; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 4 above.

4. Claims **3, 6** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmerman (US 2004/0226031) in view of Popp (US 7162596 B2) view of Hoover et al (US. Patent 5,560005), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Burns et al (US. Patent 6,088,694).

As to claim 3, Zimmerman, Popp and Hoover do not explicit teach the software routine controls a data modification operation by the second data handling application in dependence upon data stored in the first data handling application. However, Burns teaches the software routine controls a data modification operation by the second data handling application in dependence upon data stored in the first data handling application (an application user of the computing system 10 issues an SQL Insert, SQL delete, or SQL update call in the database, the DBMS detects that this operation occur on a column of type datalink, col 9, ln 1-5).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Zimmerman, Popp, Hoover with Burns to incorporate the feature of the software routine controls a data modification operation by the second data handling application in dependence upon data stored in the first data handling application because this allows an efficiency managing access and control over data that is linked to a database system.

As to claim 6, it is an apparatus claim of claim 3; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 3 above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-3767. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sough Hyung can be reached on (571) 272-6799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

/LeChi Truong/

Examiner, Art Unit 2194

LeChi Truong

June 12, 2009

Application/Control Number: 10/073,329
Art Unit: 2194

Page 8